IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

EVAN RICHARDSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 21-1347

SOLICITOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 31st day of March 2022, upon consideration of the Norriton Defendants' Motion to Dismiss [Doc. No. 3], County Defendants Motion to Dismiss [Doc. No. 4], and the related briefing, and for the reasons set forth in the Memorandum Opinion to follow, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Motions are **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part, as follows:

- 1. The motion to dismiss Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims against Defendant Frame on the basis of absolute immunity is **DENIED.**
- 2. The motion to dismiss Plaintiff's state law claims against Defendant Frame on the basis of absolute immunity is **GRANTED**, and these claims are **DISMISSED** with **prejudice**.
- 3. The motion to dismiss Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and state law claims against

 Defendant Naber on the basis of qualified immunity is **DENIED without prejudice**.
- 4. The motion to dismiss Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 abuse of process claim against Defendants Naber and Frame is **DENIED**.
- 5. The motions to dismiss Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims against Defendants West Norriton Township and Montgomery County due to failure to plead viable *Monell* claims are **GRANTED**. These claims are **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

6. The motions to dismiss Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1985 conspiracy claims are **GRANTED** for failure to state plausible claims. These claims are **DISMISSED without**

prejudice.

7. The motions to dismiss Plaintiff's battery, false imprisonment, and intentional infliction

of emotional distress claims against Defendants West Norriton Township and

Montgomery County are **GRANTED**. These claims are **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

8. The motion to dismiss Plaintiff's consortium claim against all Defendants is **GRANTED**.

This claim is **DISMISSED with prejudice**.

9. To the extent that Defendants' motions incorporate motions to strike, these motions are

GRANTED subject to amendment.

It is further **ORDERED** that Plaintiff is granted leave to file an amended complaint on or

before **April 22, 2022**.

It is so **ORDERED.**

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Cynthia M. Rufe

CYNTHIA M. RUFE, J.